

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/705,777	_	11/10/2003	Robert D. Wachel	Intel 2207/906702	4393	
25693	7590	11/01/2005		EXAMINER		
		ON (SAN JOSE)	LEE, BENNY T			
333 WEST S SUITE 600	SAN CAR	LOS 51.		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
SAN JOSE,	CA 951	0		2817		
				DATE MAILED: 11/01/200	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	21
	10/705,777	WACHEL, ROBERT D.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Benny Lee	2817	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address	••
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC c, cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this communic ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 N	ovember 2003.		
<i>,</i> —	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa			ts is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 32-47 is/are pending in the application	n.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>32-44</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) 45-47 is/are objected to.	r cleation requirement		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			•
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. Note the attache	ed Office Action of form P1O-15	2.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in	Application No	
Copies of the certified copies of the prio	rity documents have bee	n received in this National Stage	Э
application from the International Burea	•		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies no	t received.	
Attachment(s)	_		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date	
Notice of Dransperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	——————————————————————————————————————	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In paragraphs [0014] & [0033], note that "1a-b" should be rewritten as --1a-1b-- for clarity of description. In paragraphs [0015] & [0041], note that "2a-b" should be rewritten as --2a-2b-- for clarity of description. In paragraph [0065], note that --(Fig. 1)-- should be inserted follow "110" & "119" for consistency of description. Appropriate correction is required.

The following claims have been found objectionable for reasons set forth below:

In claims 42, line 1 & claim 44, line 2, note that "the first" should be rephrased as --a first-- to avoid lack of antecedent basis.

In claim 44, line 1, note that "the second" should be rephrased as --<u>a</u> second-- to avoid lack of antecedent basis.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 32, 34, 35, 37-39, 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Marshall et al.

Marshall et al (Fig. 1) discloses a pair parallel of copper conductors (11, 12) etched onto a surface of a lower half of an insulated laminate board, which in combination with an upper half of the laminated board encompasses the pair of copper conductors as described at column 2, line 64 to column 3, line 6. As depicted in the alternate embodiment of Fig. 4, the encompassing laminate structure further includes upper vertical ground plane (115) disposed above the pair of copper conductors and lower vertical ground plane (116) disposed below the pair of copper

Art Unit: 2817

conductors, and these ground planes are affixed to respective outer surfaces of the upper & lower half of the laminated boards. Additionally, side ground planes (120) are affixed to edges of the laminate board, such that one side ground plane is the left of one of the copper conductors while the other side ground plane is to the right of the other side ground plane. Note that the side ground planes are oriented perpendicular to the vertical ground planes as well as being oriented parallel to the pair of copper conductors, as to provide an overall grounding shield for the copper conductors.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 32-42, 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Green et al.

Green et al (Fig. 11) discloses a differential pair of parallel conductors (1, 2) which is encases by a dielectric casing or body (4). Moreover, note that a ground shield (3) also surrounds the differential pair of conductors (1, 2). In particular, note that the ground shield comprises: side ground conductor portions which run parallel to the differential pair of conductors and which are respectively oriented to the left and the right of the differential pair of conductors (1, 2). Furthermore, note that semi-circular vertical ground conductor portions which are respectively above and below the differential pair of conductors are connected to the side ground plane portions. However, Green et al differs from the claimed invention in that the material of the

Art Unit: 2817

differential pair of conductors (1, 2) is not explicitly specified as being copper and that specific dimensional parameters of the differential pair of conductors is not explicitly disclosed.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious in view of the references, taken as a whole, to have realized the differential pair of conductors as being formed of copper. Such a modification would have been obvious since copper is a well recognized conductive material used for signal conductors and that Green et al does suggest that copper is a preferred conductive material as indicated at page 4, left column, lines 44-46, thereby suggesting the obviousness of the modification. As for the specific dimensional recitations, such dimensions would have been considered obvious optimization of desired parameters within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art, especially given the general conditions set forth for differential pair of conductors set forth by Green et al, thereby further suggesting the obviousness of such a modification.

Claims 33, 36, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al.

Marshall et al discloses the claimed invention except for the specific dimensional parameters as recited in the above cited claims.

However, such dimensional wouls have been considered obvious optimization of desirable parameter within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art, especially given the general conditions set forth for differential pair of conductors set forth by Marshall et al, thereby suggesting the obviousness of such a modification.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2817

Bobisch et al discloses a differential conductor pair (e.g. 1, 2) surrounded by a rectangular shape shielding structure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Benny Lee at telephone number 571 272 1764.

B. Lee

PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 2817